

REMARKS

The examiner's Action dated January 11, 2007, has been received, and its contents carefully noted. In addition, appreciation is expressed to examiner SIMONE for his assistance in during a telephone conference held with undersigned council on April 4, 2007.

During the telephone conference, the drawing objection and claim rejection presented in the Office Action were discussed in detail. In particular, it was pointed out that the principal hydraulic circuit is fully illustrated in the application drawing. Specifically, a description of the components of the principal hydraulic circuit is provided in the specification at page 3, lines 6-10, and this hydraulic circuit is described at page 10, lines 8-14 of the specification, where there are included reference numerals that appear in the application drawing and that identify the components of the hydraulic circuit. The specification has been amended, at page 10, to clarify that the reservoir is not being described as part of the principal hydraulic circuit, so that the description of Figure 1 is now fully consistent with the description appearing at page 3, lines 6-10.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the principal hydraulic circuit is clearly described in the specification and fully illustrated in the application drawing. It is

further submitted that the specification is now completely consistent with regard to the identity of the principal hydraulic circuit.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly identify the components of the hydraulic circuit, consistent with the description of that circuit in the specification.

Accordingly, it is requested that the objection to the drawings and the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In addition, submitted herewith for the examiner's consideration is a new independent claim 15 that corresponds in substance to claim 1, and only differs therefrom by the omission of any mention of a principal hydraulic circuit. Claim 15 does define the essential components of that circuit and the structural relationship among the connection device, the reservoir, the pump and the pressure reduction conduit. The recitation in claim 15 of a connection device connecting the reservoir with the pump is supported by the disclosure in the present specification at page 12, lines 14-20, wherein it is disclosed that conduit 38 connects funnel 30, which is part of the connection device, to reservoir 4. The paragraph extending between pages 3 and 4 of this specification explicitly states that the connection device places the

reservoir in communication with the aspiration conduit of the pump.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the drawing objection and the claim rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, that all the claims now be allowed and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\seb\Lafond 1\Pto\2007-04-06-amendment.doc